

and to attract even more visitors. So, what time doesn't do to our buildings, popularity will—and thank goodness for that.

More than 90 percent of Smithsonian visitors are Americans, many traveling great distances on a pilgrimage to the nation's secular shrines—the Capitol, the White House, the Library of Congress, the many memorials to brave Americans. The history of the nation is built into such structures. They're the physical manifestation of our shared sense of national identity.

Smithsonian Institution buildings belong in the company of those other monuments, because the Smithsonian is the center of our cultural heritage—the repository of the creativity, the courage, the aspirations and the ingenuity of the American people. Its collections hold a vast portion of the material record of democratic America.

The most sophisticated virtual representation on a screen cannot match the experience of standing just a few feet from the star-spangled banner, or the lap-top desk on which Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, or the hat Lincoln wore the night he was shot, or the Wright brothers' Flyer and the Spirit of St. Louis. All those icons of America's history, and countless others of comparable significance, are at the Smithsonian.

And yet the experience of viewing them is compromised by the physical deterioration of the Smithsonian's buildings, which are becoming unworthy of the treasures they contain. The family on a once-in-a-lifetime trip to Washington and the Smithsonian should not have to make allowances—to overlook peeling paint, leak-stained ceilings and ill-lit exhibition spaces.

We can try to hide the problems behind curtains and plastic sheeting. But the reality cannot be concealed: The buildings are too shabby. In the nation's museum—to which Americans have contributed more than 12 billion of their tax dollars over the years—this embarrassment is not acceptable. It's no way to represent America.

The Smithsonian has hesitated in the past to put before Congress the full scale of its repair and renovation needs. It has tried instead to make do. But it will be undone by making do, and the American people will be the losers.

So we intend to face the problem and to transform the physical environment of the Smithsonian during the coming decade. The United States is in a period of immense public and private prosperity, and we should take every opportunity to turn that wealth to the long-term well-being and enhancement of the nation. Restoring the museums of the Smithsonian to a condition that befits the high place of our nation in the world will be a splendid legacy from this generation to future generations of Americans.

In January the nation will swear in the new century's first Congress and inaugurate its first president. They must be committed to preserving the nation's heritage. At the same time, we as private citizens must do our part to meet this critical need.

Americans should not have to wonder why their treasures are housed in buildings that seem to be falling apart. Instead they should marvel at the grandeur of the spaces and at the objects that are the icons of our history.

CHINA PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to spend a few moments talking about the issue of PNTR, Permanent Normal Trade Relations, with China. Last month, the House passed H.R.

4444. That bill authorizes PNTR for China once the multilateral protocol negotiations are completed and the WTO General Council approves China's accession. The bill includes a solid package of provisions that establishes a framework for monitoring progress and developments in China in the human rights area. It also provides for enhanced monitoring of China's compliance with its trade commitments.

Now, it is our turn in the Senate to act. We have two challenges. First, we need to debate the bill now, not later. And, second, we need to pass the bill without amendment. I call on the Majority Leader to set a date certain in July to start this process.

Extending permanent normal trade relations status to China. Regularizing our economic and trade relationship with China. Bringing China into the global trade community. Helping the development of a middle class in China. Developing an environment between our two countries where we can productively engage China in significant security, regional, and global discussions. These are not Democratic issues. These are not Republican issues. These are national issues. Passage of PNTR is a first step, and it is critical to America's national economic and security interests.

Support in the Senate is strong. I believe there will be an overwhelming vote in favor of final passage. Republicans and Democrats. Small states and large. East and West. North and South. Conservative and liberal. Most of us recognize how important this is to our country, to the region, and to the world.

That is why I will continue to urge the Majority Leader to set a firm date to bring the PNTR bill to the floor so we can move this legislation. I ask my colleagues, Republican, as well as Democrat, to join me in delivering that message to the Majority Leader.

Once it comes to the floor, there will likely be a plethora of amendments, some germane and others non-germane. The Senate has its own rights and prerogatives. I will always defend the right of Senators to offer amendments to a bill. But, I am concerned that amendments in the Senate, which would force the bill into a conference with the House, would lead to delaying, and perhaps jeopardizing, final passage of this landmark legislation. We cannot afford such a development.

H.R. 4444 is a very balanced bill. It deals with the major concerns relative to China's entry into the global trading system. Therefore, along with many of my colleagues, I have made a commitment to oppose any amendment to H.R. 4444, no matter how meritorious the amendment might be on its own terms. Prompt passage and enactment of this bill should be a top bipartisan priority. I urge all my colleagues to join me in making the commitment to oppose any attempt to amend this legislation.

H.R. 4444 ensures that future U.S. administrations will closely monitor Chi-

na's compliance with its WTO obligations and with other trade agreements made with the United States. It will make the administration in the future act promptly in the case of damaging import surges. It provides for a vigorous monitoring of human rights, worker rights, and the import of goods produced by forced or prison labor. H.R. 4444 also provides for technical assistance to help develop the rule of law in China. It enhances the ability of U.S. government radios to broadcast into China. And it states the sense of Congress regarding Taiwan's prompt admission to the WTO.

To repeat, extending PNTR to China is vitally important to America's economic and strategic interests. Our top priority should be a bill approved by the Senate identical to H.R. 4444 so that it can immediately be sent to the President for signature. I hope we complete action rapidly in July.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, June 28, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,649,147,080,050.00 (Five trillion, six hundred forty-nine billion, one hundred forty-seven million, eighty thousand, fifty dollars and no cents).

One year ago, June 28, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,640,294,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred forty billion, two hundred ninety-four million).

Five years ago, June 28, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,948,205,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred forty-eight billion, two hundred five million).

Twenty-five years ago, June 28, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$535,337,000,000 (Five hundred thirty-five billion, three hundred thirty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,113,810,080,050.00 (Five trillion, one hundred thirteen billion, eight hundred ten million, eighty thousand, fifty dollars and no cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HOW NOT TO SQUANDER OUR SUPERPOWER STATUS

• Mr. BIDEN. I rise today to comment briefly on an extremely thought-provoking opinion piece by Josef Joffe in the June 20th edition of the New York Times. The article was entitled "A Warning from Putin and Schroeder." It describes how the current global predominance of the United States is being countered by constellations of countries, which include allies and less-friendly powers alike, and how American behavior is aiding and abetting this development.

Mr. Joffe is the co-editor of the prestigious German weekly *Die Zeit*. He received his university education in the United States and is well known and respected in American foreign policy

circles. In short, his thoughts are advice from a friend, not hostile criticism from an embittered or jealous antagonist.

The take-off point of the article, from which its headline is derived, was the recent summit meeting in Berlin between German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and Russian President Vladimir Putin during which Putin employed the classic Muscovite tactic of wooing Europe's key country in an effort to have it join Russia as a counterweight to us.

Fair enough, Joffe says. Whenever the international system has been dominated by one power, a natural movement to restore the balance has arisen. With regard to the United States, this is nothing new—the Chinese, as well as the Russians, have been decrying a “unipolar world” and “hegemonism” for years.

But Germany—the country the United States practically reinvented from the ashes of World War II, ushered back into the civilized family of nations, and then stood out as the only champion of re-unification only a decade ago? No matter how gushy a host he wished to be, how could the Chancellor of this Germany suddenly be calling for a “strategic partnership” with Russia?

One answer, according to Joffe, is the obvious and passionate hostility to the U.S. national missile defense project, known popularly as NMD, which the Russians and our German allies—for that matter, all of our European allies—share.

A second reason can be traced to the obvious shock at the overwhelming American military superiority shown in last year's Yugoslav air campaign. The manifest European military impotence impelled the European Union to launch its own security and defense policy, which NATO is now struggling to integrate into the alliance.

To some extent, then, the very fact of our current power—military, economic, and cultural—makes attempts at creating a countervailing force nearly inevitable.

But there is more. It is not only the policy that spawned NMD that irritates our European allies. What also irks them is the cavalier way in which we neglected to consult with them in our rush to formulate that policy. As Joffe trenchantly puts it, “America is so far ahead of the crowd that it has forgotten to look back.”

In this, the second half of his explanation, I fear that Joffe is on to something: a new kind of American hubris. Again, his use of English is enviable. He describes the behavior of Congress these days as “obliviousness with a dollop of yahooism” (I assume he isn't talking about the search engine).

Mr. President, no one loves and respects this body more than I do. I believe that the American people is exceedingly well served by the one hundred Senators, all of whom are intelligent and hard-working.

Nevertheless, I note with dismay an increasing tendency in this chamber—I will leave judgments of the House of Representatives to others—for Members to advocate aspects of foreign policy with a conscious disregard, occasionally even disdain, for the opinions of our allies and the impact our policies have on them.

This kind of unilateralism was exhibited in the floor debate last fall on ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by one of my colleagues who, in responding to an article jointly authored by British Prime Minister Tony Blair, French President Jacques Chirac, and German Chancellor Schroeder, declared: “I don't care about our allies. I care about our enemies.”

No one, Mr. President, is advocating abandoning or compromising the national interest of the United States simply because our allies oppose this or that aspect of our foreign and security policy.

But power—in the current context, our unparalleled power—must be accompanied by a sense of responsibility.

Mr. Joffe alludes to this power-and-responsibility duality in recalling the golden age of bipartisan American foreign policy in the years immediately following the Second World War, when Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg and Democratic President Harry S. Truman collaborated on halting the spread of communism and on helping create the international institutions that remain the cornerstones of our world more than half a century later. As he puts it “responsibility must defy short-term self-interest or the domestic fixation of the day.”

Mr. President, one does not have to agree with all of Joffe's arguments to admit that his assertions at least merit our serious consideration. For if we do not begin to realize that even the United States of America needs to factor in the opinions of its friends when formulating foreign policy, it may not have many friends to worry about in the future.

And if that development occurs, we will almost certainly no longer retain the sole superpower status that we now enjoy. •

TRIBUTE ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MANCHESTER, VERMONT

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to note the 100th anniversary of the Charter of Manchester Village.

Manchester Village lies in the valley of the Battenkill River nestled between the Green Mountains to the east and the Taconic Mountains to the west. Due to its geography and topography, Manchester Village has been at the crossroads of the earliest trails and roads in Vermont. The slopes of Mount Equinox, which rise 3,800 feet above the village, provide numerous fresh water streams and natural springs for the enjoyment of the resident and visiting populations.

From its earliest days to the period of the Civil War, Manchester was very much frontier country with numerous inns and taverns at its crossroads. In 1781, according to the town history detailed in the 1998 Village Plan, “there were no churches, but there were four taverns, a jail, a pillory and a whipping post.” But by 1840, Vermont was the slowest growing state in the Union, as much of the natural resources of the state had been depleted, and wool imports from Australia had brought an end to a brief boom of sheep raising in Manchester and other parts of the state.

Beginning just prior to the Civil War, however, tourists began to discover Manchester. In 1853, the Equinox Hotel was opened by Franklin Orvis, who converted an inn that had begun in 1770. In 1863, when Mrs. Abraham Lincoln and her son, Robert Todd, stepped off the ten o'clock train, Manchester's reputation was made. Later, Presidents Ulysses S. Grant, William Howard Taft, Benjamin Harrison, Theodore Roosevelt, and Vice-President James S. Sherman would follow as visitors to Manchester Village.

Today, the Equinox remains as one of Vermont's grandest establishments. The Village is also home to Hildene, the summer home of Robert Todd Lincoln and now operated as a house museum. The Southern Vermont Art Center, the Mark Skinner Library, Burr and Burton Academy, and two world class golf courses can be found in Manchester Village, along with numerous delightful inns and hotels, charming churches, exquisite restaurants, engaging museums, enchanting galleries and unique shops.

Manchester Village thrives today in large part due to careful planning and the guardianship of an impressive streetscape characterized by marble sidewalks, deep front lawns, large, historic buildings, and an absence of fences. Village residents have faced the challenge of responsible and active stewardship since the tourist boom of the second half of the 19th century, and the Village Charter is an important part of that history.

For some details of the genesis of the incorporation of Manchester Village 100 years ago, I turn to “The Manchester Village Charter,” written by Mary Hard Bort and reprinted here by permission of the Manchester Journal. Congratulations to the Village of Manchester on the event of its 100th birthday. I ask that that be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows.

THE MANCHESTER VILLAGE CHARTER (By Mary Hard Bart)

By 1900 a building boom was flourishing in Manchester Village. It was nearly impossible to hire a carpenter and the “summer people” who intended to build “cottages” that year often found it necessary to hire labor from out of town.

Some twenty years earlier in 1880 Village boundaries had been laid out by the town's selectmen and approved by the Vermont Legislature for the purpose of providing fire protection in Fire District #2 (the Village).